Case 2:18-cv-09187-PA-AFM Document 59 Filed 12/19/19 Page 1 of 7 Page ID #:569

This motion will be made pursuant to Federal Rule 56, Local Rule 16-9, and all applicable California case law, on this Notice, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities attached hereto, the Declarations attached hereto, on the pleadings, records and files in this action, and upon such other argument and evidence as the Court may entertain at the hearing of this matter.

///

///
DATED: December (19), 2019

By:

Attorney for Defendant Angela N. Rodriguez and Mi Pueblito Restaurant, Inc.

# **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES**

This case involves the alleged failure of defendants to comply with the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a); and the California Unruh Act, Cal. Civ. Code § 51.

Plaintiff Juan Garibay (hereinafter referred to as "Plaintiff" or "Garibay"), was and is a disabled individual. Defendant ANGELA N. RODRIGUEZ, an individual, (hereinafter referred to as "Angela N. Rodriguez" and/or "Defendants") and the corporation MI PUEBLITO RESTAURANT, INC (hereinafter referred to as "Mi Pueblito" and/or "Defendants"), was the owner of the Mexican Restaurant at 12824 Van Nuys Blvd, Pacoima, CA 91331.

### **INTRODUCTORY FACTS**

In this ADA compliance case filed by serial filer Juan Garibay against Defendants ANGELA N. RODRIGUEZ AND MI PUEBLITO RESTAURANT, INC., Defendant Angela N. Rodriguez built the restaurant building in 2008 and passed all applicable State of California and County of Los Angeles codes in force and effect at that time. Angela N. Rodriguez is 70 years old and retired. She leased the restaurant in 2018 prior to the filing of the instant case and has taken steps to dissolve the corporation which plaintiff Juan Garibay has chosen to sue.

Plaintiff Juan Garibay supposedly visited defendants' restaurant, along with some 14 other business locations, in recent months around the time of the filing and fabricated lawsuits against unsuspecting business owners in order to extort money from them due to nominal insufficiencies in their levels of ADA compliance. At the time the attorneys for plaintiff sent out letters and made phone calls to defendant, who speaks only Spanish, that they would settle their claims for \$4,000.00 and that if defendants chose not to settle that the amounts that would be claimed if a lawsuit was filed would be significantly higher.

Defendants, of their own volition, redid the handicap parking space in order to comply with the ADA. Nevertheless, plaintiff counsel continues to rigorously pursue this retired business woman who simply owns the property with the threat of attorney fees. Despite 30 years in the restaurant business, regular customers in wheelchairs who never a complained, this gentleman comes from a different city and state and manufactures a lawsuit at the direction of this this scourge of California lawyers who have gotten rich extorting money from small business.

The Court has already found that said plaintiff is a multiple filer has not complied with the requirements of the Central District case law and as a result the state claims were in effect dismissed because the court chose not to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims. Further, despite the completion of the discovery requests, plaintiffs have filed a motion to compel responses that were provided last June.

II.

## **LEGAL STANDARD**

Per the motion to continue the MSJ hearing, no previous continuances were had. Defendants request a continuance to respond due to failure of plaintiffs' to mail the MSJ Motion and attachments, and due to the plaintiff's failure to provide deposition dates for plaintiff;s deposition and due to recent receipt of the Mi Pueblito CASp Report, **Exhibit 1**, and the extrenuous circumstances as set forth in the Declaration of Defendant Angela N. Rodriguez and counsel Donald A. Hilland.

||///

///

 III.

### **FAILURE TO MEET AND CONFER**

Defense counsel was never able to speak to plaintiff counsel about the filing of the MSJ and the dates. If emails were sent, none were received because there are too many different attorneys on this case and their emails are not recognized. Again no one picked up the phone and called. This could have been easily resolved if defense counsel had simply met and conferred.

# IV. CONCLUSION

Defendants request the Court continue the hearing due to their receipt of the Mi Pueblito CASp Report, Exhibit 1, and their current efforts to make the recommendations in the report to their location. Also defendants have asked for the deposition of plaintiff but no dates were provided. Defendants are requesting that the Court put the Motion for Summary Judgment out for 60 days to give defendants time to comply with the recommendations in the report and for us to respond timely take Plaintiff's deposition. Therefore, Defendants seek an order from this Court for to continue the MSJ hearing for 60 days.

|///

25 | ///

26 | ///

	Case 2:18-cv-09187-PA-AFM Document 59 Filed 12/19/19 Page 6 of 7 Page ID #:574
	DATED, December 2010
1	DATED: December, 2019
2	By:
3	ANGELA N. RODRIGUEZ,
4	MI PUEBLITO RESTAURANT
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
28	
20	6
	DEFENDANTS OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION TO COMPEL

DEFENDANTS OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION TO COMPEL

Case 2:18-cv-09187-PA-AFM Document 59 Filed 12/19/19 Page 7 of 7 Page ID #:575